REMARKS

1.   Applicant thanks the Office for its observations and remarks, which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

2.   **35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-8, 11-21, 24-26 are rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. patent application pub. no. 2001/0029534 ("Spinks") in view of U.S patent application pub. no. 2004/0003058 ("Trossen") and further in view of U.S patent application pub. no. 2002/0133555 ("Hall").

Claim 1:   The Office relies on Spinks, ¶ 0068 as teaching or suggesting "a registration/query processor configured for providing the identifying information to a directory server to register the network device on a directory server."   Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant first notes that there is no teaching or suggestion in Spinks of a "registration/query processor."   While Spinks does describe a reporting module 88, the function of the reporting module is to "report endpoint connection information" to an admin module 86.   Thus, Spinks describes an element that is analogous to a registration processor, but there is no teaching or suggestion in Spinks of a registration/query processor.

The Office next relies on Trossen, ¶¶ 0028-0029 as teaching or suggesting "a registration/query processor. . . for transmitting query messages regarding the first network to said directory server."   Applicant respectfully disagrees.   The cited paragraphs from Trossen describe that a mobile terminal 18 registers with a proxy 14 on a company network. The same device also sends a QUERY message to the proxy 14. There is no teaching or suggestion however, that the same element within the mobile terminal both registers the device with the proxy and queries the proxy. Hall adds nothing to the combination.   Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of a registration/query processor that both reports registration information to a directory server and directs queries to the directory server.

In order to describe the subject matter of the Claim more thoroughly, Claim 1 is amended to describe a "registration and query processor." Support for the amendment is implicit in Claim 1. Additional support for the amendment is found in Fig. 3, denoted by reference figure 52, and in the accompanying description.

Claim 1 is additionally amended to describe that a registration and query processor for providing the identifying information to_a directory server to register the network device on said directory server. Support for the amendment is implicit in the Claim as filed. Additional support is found in Fig. 1 of the Application and the accompanying description. As shown in Fig. 2 of Spinks, the reporting module 88 relays no information to the administrative computer 84, but to a network infrastructure device 76. Accordingly, there is no teaching in Spinks of "a registration and query processor for providing the identifying information to_a directory server to register the network device on said directory server." Neither Trossen nor Hall add anything to Spinks. Thus, the combination fails to teach or suggest a registration and query processor as in Claim 1.

Claim 14: The Office relies on Spinks, ¶ 0081 as teaching or suggesting "a query processor adapted to request information regarding the first network from a directory server." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited paragraph from Spinks describes an inventory module 166 that "may be responsible to identify network devices 90 local to the node 74 hosting the reporting module 88 and obtain end point connection information corresponding to such network devices 90." Additionally, the inventory module 166 "may also be responsible to detect and transmit software and hardware configuration information corresponding to a node 74 and other network devices 90."

The Office has established that Spinks's administration computer 84 corresponds to the directory server of Claim 14. There is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Spinks that the inventory module 166 queries the administration computer 84 for any type of information. As described in ¶ 0081, the information gathered by the inventory module 166 -- identifying network devices local to the node, endpoint information for

devices <u>local to the node</u>, and software and hardware configuration information <u>corresponding to the node 74 and other network devices 90</u> – is completely local to the node 74 hosting the reporting module 88 of which the inventory module is an element. Accordingly, the only entities that the inventory module 166 needs to query in order to obtain the inventory information are the node 74 itself and the associated network devices 90.

In fact, It cannot be said that the inventory module 166 has <u>any communication at all</u> with the administration computer. While ¶ 0081 describes that the inventory module may transmit information, there is no description anywhere in Spinks's disclosure that the inventory module transmits information to the administration computer, or of where else the information may be transmitted. As described in ¶ 0081, the reporting module 88 includes a communication module 162 that "may be responsible for . . . transmitting information, including without limitation end point connection information 100, to the admin module 86." Accordingly, although not explicitly stating so, ¶ 0081 implicitly teaches that the inventory module "transmits" information to the communication module 162 for transmission to the administration computer 84.

¶ 0080 of Spinks does describe a query module 164. But the function of the query module is to obtain endpoint connection information from network infrastructure devices 76 for transmission to the administration computer by the communication module 162. Accordingly, even the query module 164 does not direct any type of query to the administration computer 84, or otherwise communicate with the administration computer.

Accordingly, the present finding that Spinks teaches or suggests "a query processor adapted to request information regarding the first network <u>from a directory server</u>" is incorrect. Hall adds nothing to Spinks. There is therefore, no teaching or suggestion in the combination of:

"A network device coupled to a first network, the network device comprising:

information identifying the network device on the first network, wherein the network device is located inside a firewall; and

a query processor adapted to request information regarding the first network from a directory server, wherein the directory server is coupled to a third network and is located outside the firewall."

Because the combination fails to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter, the present rejection is improper. Claim 14 is therefore deemed allowable over the combination. In view of their dependence from an allowable parent Claim, Claim 14's dependent Claims are deemed allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

Claim 1: Claim is amended to describe:

"information identifying the network device on the first network, wherein the network device is located inside a firewall; and

a registration/query processor configured for providing the identifying information to register the network device on a directory server and for transmitting query messages regarding the first network to said directory server, wherein the directory server is coupled to a third network and is located outside the firewall."

Support for the amendment is found in Claim 14. Additional support for the amendment is found in U.S patent application pub. no. 2005/0216575 , at least at ¶ 0048. There is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of such subject matter. Because the combination fails to teach or suggest all elements of amended Claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome. Amended Claim 1 is therefore deemed allowable over the combination. In view of their dependence from an allowable parent Claim, Claim 1's dependent Claims are deemed allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

3.   No new matter is added by way of the foregoing amendments. Such amendments are made only for expediency's sake in deference to the Office policy of compact prosecution. Such do not indicate agreement by Applicant with the Office's position. Nor do they reflect intent to sacrifice claim scope. In fact, Applicant expressly reserves the right to obtain patent protection of a scope it reasonably believes it is entitled to in future submissions to the Office.

4.   For the record, Applicant respectfully traverses any and all factual assertions in the file that are not supported by documentary evidence. Such include assertions based on findings of inherency, assertions based on official notice, and any other assertions of what is well known or commonly known in the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Application is deemed in allowable condition. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the Application, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862